

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498**Serial No. 10/584,657**

Reply to Office Action dated: 2/05/08

Response dated: 04/09/08

**PATENT
PA040004****REMARKS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that claims 1-8 are pending in the application and that claims 1-8 stand rejected. By this response, claims 1-2 and 5-6 are amended to more clearly define the invention of the Applicant and not in response to prior art. Support for the Applicant's amendments to the claims can be found throughout the Applicant's Specification and specifically on page 4, lines 4 to 11 of the Specification.

In view of the amendments presented above and the following discussion, the Applicant respectfully submits that none of these claims 1-8 now pending in the application are rendered obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Thus, the Applicant believes that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

Rejections**A. 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner rejected the Applicant's claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hopkins et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,345,347, hereinafter "Hopkins") in view of Ikeda (U.S. Patent No. 5,715,218). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner alleges that with regards to the Applicant's claim 1, Hopkins teaches a method for driving a disk drive in a power save mode having the steps of:

- receiving an indication to start power save mode;
- turning off a servo driver of the disk drive;
- after that, turning off a data separator of the disk drive;
- awaiting an indication to stop power save mode;
- turning on said data separator; and
- after that, turning on said servo driver.

As conceded by the Examiner however, Hopkins does not specifically teach to turn off a photodetector as taught in the Applicant's Specification and as claimed by at least the Applicant's claim 1. In addition, however, contrary to the Examiners assertion, the Applicant submits that Hopkins also fails to teach, suggest or disclose

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498**Serial No. 10/584,657**

Reply to Office Action dated: 2/05/08

Response dated: 04/09/08

**PATENT
PA040004**

to turn off the servo driver of the disk drive by disabling the driving signals from the servo driver as taught in the Applicant's Specification and now claimed by at least the Applicant's amended claim 1. Hopkins, in fact, only indicates that the servo circuitry and the actuator circuitry can be enabled and disabled. No information is given in Hopkins, however, how this enabling and disabling is performed. As such, the Applicant submits that Hopkins fails to teach or suggest to disable the driving signals from the servo driver by disabling a supply of power to the servo driver with a controller included in the servo driver as taught in the Applicant's Specification and claimed by at least the Applicant's amended claim 1.

The Applicant further submits that the teachings of Ikeda absolutely fail to bridge the substantial gap between the teachings of Hopkins and the invention of the Applicant, at least with regards to the Applicant's claim 1.

That is, the Applicant submits that Ikeda teaches a method for power saving in an optical disk drive, wherein a laser diode is turned off in a power save mode. Ikeda, however, does not specifically teach to also turn off a photodetector, though the Examiner has interpreted the turning off of the laser diode to constitute a turning off of the photodetector. In any case, however, Ikeda does not teach or suggest to turn off the servo driver of the disk drive by disabling the driving signals from the servo driver as taught in the Applicant's Specification and as now claimed by at least the Applicant's amended claim 1. In addition, the Applicant submits that Ikeda fails to teach or suggest to disable the driving signals from the servo driver by disabling a supply of power to the servo driver with a controller included in the servo driver as taught in the Applicant's Specification and as now claimed by at least the Applicant's amended claim 1.

Therefore, the Applicant submits that for at least the reasons recited above, the teachings of Hopkins and Ikeda, alone or in any allowable combination, absolutely fail to teach, suggest or make obvious at least "turning off a servo driver of the optical disk drive by disabling the driving signals from the servo driver by disabling a supply of power to the servo driver with a controller included in the servo driver" as taught in the Applicant's Specification and as now claimed by at least the Applicant's amended claim 1.

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498**Serial No. 10/584,657**

Reply to Office Action dated: 2/05/08

Response dated: 04/09/08

**PATENT
PA040004**

Therefore, the Applicant submits that for at least the reasons recited above, the Applicant's claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the teachings of Hopkins and Ikeda, alone or in any allowable combination, and, as such, fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103 and is patentable thereunder.

Likewise, the Applicant's independent claim 5 recites similar relevant features as the Applicant's claim 1. Therefore, the Applicant submits that for at least the reasons recited above with respect to claim 1, the Applicant's claim 5 is also not rendered obvious by the teachings of Hopkins and Ikeda, alone or in any allowable combination, and, as such, fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103 and is patentable thereunder.

Furthermore, the Applicant's dependent claims 2-4 and 6-8 depend either directly or indirectly from the Applicant's independent claims 1 and 5 and recite additional features thereof. As such, the Applicant submits that at least because the Applicant's claims 1 and 5 are not rendered obvious by the teachings of Hopkins and Ikeda, alone or in any allowable combination, the Applicant further submits that the Applicant's dependent claims 2-4 and 6-8, which depend either directly or indirectly from the Applicant's claims 1 and 5, are also not rendered obvious by the teachings of Hopkins and Ikeda, alone or in any allowable combination, and, as such, fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103 and are patentable thereunder.

The Applicant reserves the right to establish the patentability of each of the claims individually in subsequent prosecution.

B. 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected the Applicant's claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hopkins (U.S. Patent No. 5,822,288). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner alleges that, with regards to claim 1, Shinada discloses a method for driving an optical disk drive in a power save mode having the steps of:

- receiving an indication to start power save mode;
- turning off a servo driver of the optical disk drive by disabling the driving signals from the servo driver (SMUTE signal, col. 9, lines 22 to 35);
- after that, turning off a photodetector of the optical disk drive;

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498**Serial No. 10/584,657**

Reply to Office Action dated: 2/05/08

Response dated: 04/09/08

**PATENT
PA040004**

- awaiting an indication to stop power save mode;
- turning on said photodetector; and
- after that, turning on said servo driver.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Applicant submits that Shinada does not teach or suggest to disable the driving signals from the servo driver by disabling a supply of power to the servo driver with a controller included in the servo driver as taught in the Applicant's Specification and as now claimed by the Applicant's amended claim 1. That is, the solution according to the invention of the Applicant has the advantage that by turning off the servo driver indirectly (i.e. by disabling the driving signals from the servo driver by disabling a supply of power to the servo driver with a controller included in the servo driver), power is saved, as there is almost no current to the actuator coil. The Applicant submits that there is not even a hint in Shinada of this technical aspect of the Applicant's amended claim 1.

Therefore, the Applicant submits that for at least the reasons recited above, the Applicant's claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the teachings of Shinada, and, as such, fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103 and is patentable thereunder.

Likewise, the Applicant's independent claim 5 recites similar relevant features as the Applicant's claim 1. Therefore, the Applicant submits that for at least the reasons recited above with respect to claim 1, the Applicant's claim 5 is also not rendered obvious by the teachings of Shinada, and, as such, fully satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103 and is patentable thereunder.

Furthermore, the Applicant's dependent claims 2-4 and 6-8 depend either directly or indirectly from the Applicant's independent claims 1 and 5 and recite additional features thereof. As such, the Applicant submits that at least because the Applicant's claims 1 and 5 are not rendered obvious by the teachings of Shinada, the Applicant further submits that the Applicant's dependent claims 2-4 and 6-8, which depend either directly or indirectly from the Applicant's claims 1 and 5, are also not rendered obvious by the teachings of Hopkins and Ikeda, alone or in any allowable combination, and, as such, fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103 and are patentable thereunder.

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498**Serial No. 10/584,657**

Reply to Office Action dated: 2/05/08

Response dated: 04/09/08

**PATENT
PA040004**

The Applicant reserves the right to establish the patentability of each of the claims individually in subsequent prosecution.

Conclusion

Thus the Applicant submits that none of the claims, presently in the application, are rendered obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Consequently, the Applicant believes that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

Hong Wing Tse

By: 

Jorge Tony Villabon, Attorney
Reg. No. 52,322
(609) 734-6445

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

April 09, 2008